

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-14 and 28-33 are pending, of which claims 1-14 and 28 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found at least at pages 5-10 and Figs. 1-4 of the Application as filed.

Applicant's amendments and remarks after Final are appropriate under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because they address the Office's remarks in the Final Action and could not have been presented earlier. In addition, the amendments and remarks should be entered to place the case in better form for appeal.

### 35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

A. Claims 1-2, 4, 11-12, 28-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,636,929 to Frantz et al. (*hereinafter*, "Franz") in view of an IBM Technical Disclosure entitled "Multiple Control Unit/Device Emulator for Testing Computer Programs" (*hereinafter*, "IBM Technical") (*Office Action* pp. 15, 17-18, 30, and 33). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

B. Claims 3, 5, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Frantz and IBM Technical in view of a document "Universal Serial Bus (USB) Device Class Definition for Human Interface Devices (HID), Version 1.11, June 21, 2001" (*hereinafter*, "UsbHid"), and further in view of a document

1 “Universal Serial Bus Specification, Rev. 1.1, September 23, 1998” (*hereinafter*,  
2 “UsbSpecs”) (*Office Action* p.19). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

3 C. Claims 6-7 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being  
4 obvious over Frantz and IBM Technical in view of a document entitled “Code  
5 Complete, A Practical Handbook of Software Construction” by Steven McConnell  
6 (*hereinafter*, “McConnell”) (*Office Action* pp. 22 and 34). Applicant respectfully  
7 traverses the rejection.

8 D. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over  
9 Frantz and IBM Technical in view of UsbSpecs, and further in view of a document  
10 entitled “Computer Networks Third Edition” by Tanenbaum (*hereinafter*,  
11 “Tanenbaum”) (*Office Action* p.26). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

12 E. Claims 13-14 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as  
13 being obvious over Frantz and IBM Technical in view of Tanenbaum (*Office*  
14 *Action* pp. 28 and 36). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1        **Claim 1** recites an interface device for testing an in-test host's support of  
2        USB peripherals, the interface device comprising:

3                one or more USB interfaces configured to communicate with  
4                one or more USB ports of the in-test host to communicate USB  
5                messages with the in-test host;

6                a network interface configured to communicate with a  
7                peripheral emulator using a network communications protocol;

8                operating logic configured to perform actions comprising:

9                        receiving USB command messages sent from the  
10                        in-test host to the interface device;

11                        sending the received USB command messages from  
12                        the interface device to the peripheral emulator through the  
13                        network interface using the network communications  
14                        protocol;

15                        receiving USB response messages sent from the  
16                        peripheral emulator to the interface device through the  
17                        network interface using the network communications  
18                        protocol;

19                        sending the received USB response messages from the  
20                        interface device through the one or more USB interfaces to  
21                        the in-test host.

22        Frantz and/or IBM Technical do not teach or suggest the combination of  
23        features recited in claim 1. For example, Frantz and/or IBM Technical do not  
24        teach or suggest an interface device including a network interface configured to  
25        communicate with a peripheral emulator using a network communications  
26        protocol, as recited in claim 1.

1 Frantz describes a system for controlling a personal computer or server  
2 (*i.e.*, the managed computer) using a management console that is remotely located  
3 from the managed computer (*Frantz*, col.1, lines 34-37). A user at the  
4 management console will use the actual peripheral devices located at the remote  
5 management console to interact with the remote management console, and send  
6 data to a management subsystem (*Frantz*, col.3 line 65 to col.4 line 47; col.7  
7 lines 45-52).

8 The management subsystem of Frantz is connected to the managed  
9 computer via a USB bus (*Frantz*, col.11, lines 22-27). More specifically, the  
10 management subsystem can be provided integrally on the system board of the  
11 managed computer, or it can be provided as a plug-in board which connects to the  
12 system bus of the managed computer. A USB device emulator is located on the  
13 management subsystem, and mimics the operation of the peripherals available at  
14 the remote management console (*Frantz*, col.12, line 65 to col.13, line 15). In  
15 short, the emulator of Frantz is located at the managed computer. As such, Frantz  
16 does not teach or suggest an interface device including a network interface that is  
17 configured to communicate with a peripheral emulator using a network  
18 communications protocol, as recited in claim 1.

19 IBM Technical describes a micro-program “for converting a small central  
20 processing unit into a device for emulating multiple input/output devices and  
21 associated control units” (*IBM Technical*, lines 1-2). According to IBM  
22 Technical, “such an emulation capability allows the emulator to be attached to a  
23  
24  
25

1 central processing system for testing the system itself, and for testing computer  
2 programs for the system without the necessity of physically attaching the  
3 input/output devices and employing people to operate those devices,” and  
4 “provides the capability for testing programs which drive currently unavailable  
5 devices.” (*IBM Technical*, lines 1-7). However, *IBM Technical* fails to cure the  
6 deficiencies of *Frantz*, as it does not teach or suggest an interface device that  
7 includes “a network interface configured to communicate with a peripheral  
8 emulator using a network communications protocol”, as recited in claim 1.

9  
10 Frantz and/or *IBM Technical* also do not teach or suggest an interface  
11 device for testing an in-test host’s support of USB peripherals which includes  
12 operating logic configured to perform the actions recited in claim 1. More  
13 specifically, Frantz and/or *IBM Technical* do not teach or suggest an interface  
14 device for testing an in-test host’s support of USB peripherals which includes  
15 operating logic configured to perform actions comprising:

- 16  
17 (a) receiving USB command messages sent from the  
18 in-test host to the interface device;
- 19 (b) sending the received USB command messages from  
20 the interface device to the peripheral emulator through  
21 the network interface using the network  
communications protocol;
- 22 (c) receiving USB response messages sent from the  
23 peripheral emulator to the interface device through the  
24 network interface using the network communications  
25 protocol;

1 (d) sending the received USB response messages from the  
2 interface device through the one or more USB  
3 interfaces to the in-test host , as recited in claim 1  
4 (*Emphasis Added*).

5 As noted above, Frantz describes a system for controlling a personal  
6 computer or server (i.e., the managed computer) using a management console that  
7 is remotely located from the managed computer (*Frantz*, col.1, lines 34-37). A  
8 user at the management console will use the actual peripheral devices located at  
9 the remote management console to interact with the remote management console,  
10 and send data to the management subsystem (*Frantz*, col.3, line 65 to col.4, line  
11 47; col.7 lines 45-52).

12 The management subsystem of Frantz is connected to the managed  
13 computer via a USB bus (*Frantz*, col.11, lines 22-27). More specifically, the  
14 management subsystem can be provided integrally on the system board of the  
15 managed computer, or it can be provided as a plug-in board which connects to the  
16 system bus of the managed computer. A USB device emulator is located on the  
17 management subsystem, and mimics the operation of the peripherals available at  
18 the remote management console (*Frantz*, col.12, line 65 to col.13, line 15). In  
19 short, the USB emulator of Frantz is located at the managed computer.  
20  
21

22 As such, Frantz does not teach or suggest receiving USB command  
23 messages sent from an in-test host to an interface device, and then sending the  
24 received USB command messages from the interface device to the peripheral  
25

1 emulator through the network interface using the network communications  
2 protocol, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Frantz describes that the USB device  
3 emulator is part of the management subsystem which is located at the managed  
4 computer (*Frantz*, col.11, lines 5-9).

5 Since the emulator described in Frantz is a USB device emulator which is  
6 located at the management subsystem, Frantz clearly does not disclose or suggest  
7 “sending the received USB command messages from the interface device to the  
8 peripheral emulator through the network interface using the network  
9 communications protocol”, as recited in claim 1. Even if one were to consider the  
10 management subsystem of Frantz to be the “interface device” of claim 1, Frantz  
11 does not disclose or suggest the other recited features.  
12

13 As noted previously, IBM Technical describes a micro-program “for  
14 converting a small central processing unit into a device for emulating multiple  
15 input/output devices and associated control units” (*IBM Technical*, lines 1-7).  
16 However, IBM Technical fails to cure the deficiencies of Frantz, as it does not  
17 teach or suggest receiving USB command messages sent from an in-test host to  
18 the interface device, and then sending the received USB command messages from  
19 the interface device to the peripheral emulator through the network interface using  
20 the network communications protocol, as recited in claim 1.  
21

22 Still further, Frantz does not teach or suggest operating logic configured to  
23 perform actions including “receiving USB response messages sent from the  
24 peripheral emulator to the interface device through the network interface using the  
25

1 network communications protocol” and then “sending the received USB response  
2 messages from the interface device through the one or more USB interfaces to the  
3 in-test host”, as recited in claim 1.

4 Instead, as described previously, Frantz describes that the USB device  
5 emulator is located in the management subsystem which is located at the managed  
6 computer (*Frantz*, col.11, lines 5-9; col.12, line 65 to col.13, line 15). Once again,  
7 since the emulator described by Frantz is the USB device emulator which is  
8 located in the management subsystem at the managed computer, Frantz clearly  
9 cannot teach or suggest receiving USB response messages sent from the peripheral  
10 emulator to the interface device through the network interface using the network  
11 communications protocol, and then sending the received USB response messages  
12 from the interface device through the one or more USB interfaces to the in-test  
13 host, as recited in claim 1. Even if one were to consider the management  
14 subsystem of Frantz to be the “interface device” of claim 1, Frantz does not  
15 disclose or suggest the other recited features.  
16

17 Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the Frantz, IBM Technical  
18 combination for at least the several reasons described above, and Applicant  
19 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.  
20

21  
22 **Claims 2-14** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1, and  
23 are allowable over Frantz and/or IBM Technical for the reasons described above in  
24 the response to the rejection of claim 1. Additionally, any one of claims 2, 4, and  
25



11-12 may be allowable over the Frantz, IBM Technical combination for independent reasons. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

**Claims 3, 5, and 9-10** are also allowable over the Frantz, IBM Technical, UsbHid, and UsbSpecs combination because UsbHid and UsbSpecs do not address the deficiencies of the Frantz, IBM Technical combination as described above in response to the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

**Claims 6-7** are also allowable over the Frantz, IBM Technical, and McConnell combination because McConnell does not address the deficiencies of the Frantz, IBM Technical combination as described above in response to the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

**Claim 8** is also allowable over the Frantz, IBM Technical, UsbSpecs, and Tanenbaum combination because UsbSpecs and Tanenbaum do not address the deficiencies of the Frantz, IBM Technical combination as described above in response to the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

**Claims 13-14** are also allowable over the Frantz, IBM Technical, and Tanenbaum combination because Tanenbaum does not address the deficiencies of the Frantz, IBM Technical combination as described above in response to the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

1        **Claim 28** recites a method of testing an in-test host's support of USB  
2 peripherals, the method comprising:

3                receiving USB command messages sent from the in-test host  
4 at an interface device;

5                packaging the received USB command messages in command  
6 data packets formatted in accordance with a network  
7 communications protocol;

8                sending the command data packets from the interface device  
9 to one or more peripheral emulators over network communications  
10 media;

11                receiving response data packets sent from the one or more  
12 peripheral emulators over the network communications media at the  
13 interface device, wherein the response data packets are formatted in  
14 accordance with a network communications protocol;

15                unpackaging USB response messages from the received  
16 response data packets;

17                sending the unpackaged, USB response messages from the  
18 interface device to the in-test host.

19        As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Frantz and/or  
20 IBM Technical do not teach or suggest the combination of features recited in  
21 claim 28. For example, Frantz does not teach or suggest receiving USB command  
22 messages sent from the in-test host to an interface device, packaging the received  
23 USB command messages in command data packets formatted in accordance with a  
24 network communications protocol, and then sending the command data packets  
25 from the interface device to one or more peripheral emulators over network  
communications media. Rather, Frantz describes that a USB device emulator is  
located in a management subsystem which is located at a managed computer. The

1 emulator mimics peripheral devices which are connected to a remote management  
2 console, thereby allowing a user at the remote management console to use the  
3 actual peripheral devices to transfer data to the managed computer (*Frantz*, col.3,  
4 line 65 to col.4, line 47; col.7 lines 45-52).

5 Since the emulator described by Frantz is a USB device emulator which is  
6 located at the management subsystem, Frantz clearly cannot teach or suggest  
7 “sending the command data packets from the interface device to one or more  
8 peripheral emulators over network communications media”, as recited in claim 28.  
9 Even if one were to consider the management subsystem of Frantz to be the  
10 “interface device” of claim 28, Frantz does not teach or suggest the other recited  
11 features. For example, Frantz does not describe sending command data packets  
12 from the management subsystem to one or more peripheral emulators over  
13 network communications media, since the USB emulator of Frantz is located at  
14 the management subsystem.

15 As noted previously, IBM Technical describes a micro-program “for  
16 converting a small central processing unit into a device for emulating multiple  
17 input/output devices and associated control units” (*IBM Technical*, lines 1-7).  
18 However, IBM Technical fails to cure the deficiencies of Frantz, as it does not  
19 teach or suggest receiving USB command messages sent from the in-test host to  
20 an interface device, packaging the received USB command messages in command  
21 data packets formatted in accordance with a network communications protocol,  
22 and then sending the command data packets from the interface device to one or  
23 more peripheral emulators over network communications media, as recited in  
24 claim 28.  
25

1 Still further, Frantz and/or IBM Technical also do not teach or suggest  
2 “receiving response data packets sent from the one or more peripheral emulators  
3 over the network communications media to the interface device, wherein the  
4 response data packets are formatted in accordance with a network communications  
5 protocol”, “unpackaging USB response messages from the received response data  
6 packets” and then “sending the unpackaged, USB response messages from the  
7 interface device to the in-test host” as recited in claim 28.

8 Rather, Frantz describes that the USB device emulator is located in the  
9 management subsystem at the managed computer. Once again, since the emulator  
10 described by Frantz is the USB device emulator which is located at the  
11 management subsystem, Frantz clearly cannot teach or suggest receiving response  
12 data packets sent from the one or more peripheral emulators over the network  
13 communication media to the interface device, as recited in claim 28.

14 Accordingly, claim 28 is allowable over the Frantz, IBM Technical  
15 combination for at least the several reasons described above, and Applicant  
16 respectfully request that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

17  
18 **Claims 29-33** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 28,  
19 and are allowable over Frantz and/or IBM Technical for the reasons described  
20 above in the response to the rejection of claim 28. Additionally, any one of claims  
21 29 and 31 may be allowable over the Frantz, IBM Technical combination for  
22 independent reasons. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

23 **Claim 30** is also allowable over the Frantz, IBM Technical, and McConnell  
24 combination because McConnell does not address the deficiencies of the Frantz,  
25

1 IBM Technical combination as described above in response to the rejection of  
2 claim 28. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

3 Claims 32-33 are also allowable over the Frantz, IBM Technical, and  
4 Tanenbaum combination because Tanenbaum does not address the deficiencies of  
5 the Frantz, IBM Technical combination as described above in response to the  
6 rejection of claim 28. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

### 7 No Motivation or Suggestion to Combine the References

8  
9 The Office is reminded that if the proposed modification would render the  
10 prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then  
11 there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification (MPEP §  
12 2143.01). As discussed below, modifying the system of Frantz as proposed by the  
13 Office would render the system unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.  
14 Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to modify Frantz in view of IBM  
15 Technical, as set forth in the Office Action.

16 Once again, Frantz is directed to controlling a personal computer or server  
17 (*i.e.*, managed computer) using a management console that is remotely located  
18 from the managed computer (*Frantz*, col.1 lines 34-37). Thus a user at the  
19 management console will use the actual peripheral devices located at the remote  
20 management console to interact with the remote management console, and send  
21 data to the management subsystem.

22 The Office asserts that it would have been obvious to modify the system of  
23 Frantz in view of the teachings of IBM Technical, apparently by replacing the  
24  
25

1 management console and attached peripheral devices with an emulator (which is  
2 configured to emulate various peripheral devices).

3 Applicant respectfully disagrees. Clearly, there can be no motivation to  
4 replace the management console and associated peripheral devices described in  
5 Frantz with an emulator, since Frantz relies on using these peripheral devices to  
6 control the managed computer. Therefore, making the modification proposed by  
7 the Office would render the invention of Frantz unsatisfactory for its intended  
8 purpose. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to  
9 modify the system of Frantz in such a manner.

10 In addition, if the Office is suggesting that the USB device emulator of  
11 Frantz be relocated from its position at the management sub-system to a position  
12 at the remote management console, such a relocation would also render the  
13 invention of Frantz unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. If such a relocation  
14 was implemented, and in order for the peripheral emulator to be used for testing an  
15 in-test host's support of emulated peripherals, the test system would still need an  
16 interface device, as recited in Applicant's claims.


17 All of the pending claims are rejected over the combination of Frantz and  
18 IBM Technical (with some of the claims being rejected over one or more  
19 additional references). For the reasons discussed above, the combination relied on  
20 throughout the Office Action is improper. Applicant respectfully requests  
21 reconsideration of the cited combination, and withdrawal of all the §103 rejections  
22 that include the Frantz, IBM Technical combination.

1        **Conclusion**

2        Pending claims 1-14 and 28-33 are in condition for allowance. Applicant  
3        respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If  
4        any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged  
5        to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent action.

6  
7        Respectfully Submitted,

8        Date: Feb 7, 2006

9        By:   
10        David A. Morasch  
11        Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
12        Reg. No. 42,905  
13        (509) 324-9256 ext. 210